

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25 and 28 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 10, 12, 14, 25 and 28 are amended; and Claims 2, 5, 7, 11, 13, 15, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27 and 19-105 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer by the present amendment. Claims 1, 10, 12, 14, 25 and 28 are amended to avoid interpretation under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph, and to correct minor informalities. Thus, no new matter is presented.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 14, 22, 23 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Okazawa (U.S. Pat. 6,493,101); Claims 3, 4, 6, 16, 17, 19 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Okazawa in view of Matsuda (U.S. Pub. 2002/0122203); and Claims 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Okazawa in view of Matsuda and Moffatt (U.S. Pub. 2003/0214664).

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 14, 22, 23 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Okazawa. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as independent Claims 1, 14 and 28 recite novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Independent Claim 1, for example, recites an image forming apparatus, comprising:

a program obtaining part configured to *send a screen data for inputting a program to a client terminal*, and receiving the program from the client terminal; and
style="padding-left: 40px;">a program execution part configured to execute the program received by the program obtaining part.

Independent Claims 14 and 28, while directed to alternative embodiments, recite features similar to those emphasized above. Accordingly, the remarks and arguments presented below are applicable to each of independent Claims 1, 14 and 28.

Turning to the applied reference, Okazawa describes a system for managing programs that uses a memory to store a variable in an individual area or a common area in accordance with the type of the variable.¹ The memory includes a first individual area, where a variable used by only a first program is stored even when the first program is not being executed, and a common area for storing a variable temporarily needed to execute the first program. When a second program is downloaded, a second individual area of the memory is assigned to store a variable used by the downloaded second program.

Okazawa, however, fails to disclose an image forming apparatus that includes “a program obtaining part configured to *send a screen data for inputting a program to a client terminal*,” as recited in independent Claim 1. As disclosed in an exemplary embodiment at p. 14, l. 18 – p. 15, l. 9 and Figs. 1 and 7, the image forming apparatus sends an interface (e.g. screen data) to a client terminal, which is configured to receive a program input at the client terminal.

In rejecting the above noted features recited in Claim 1, p. 3 of the Office Action relies on col. 4, l. 65 – col. 5, l. 45 of Okazawa. This cited portion of Okazawa describes that a printing apparatus 100 can “download” or transfer an “object” from an external device into a RAM 116a of the printing apparatus. The process of downloading an object is shown in Fig. 2, and described at col. 5, ll. 15-35 of Okazawa, which describes that when a downloader is started (step S201), an object is inputted from an external device via a communication line (step S202). Thus, Okazawa does describe that an “object” may be downloaded to the printing apparatus 100 from the host computer 130, but fails to disclose that any interface, or

¹ Okazawa, Abstract.

screen data, is sent from the printing apparatus 100 to the host computer 130 *for inputting a program to the host computer*, as claimed. More particularly, Okazawa fails to disclose that the printing apparatus 100 sends any type of interface, or *screen data*, to the host computer 130, whatsoever, much less an interface *for inputting a program to the host computer* 130, as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent Claims 1, 14 and 28 (and the claims that depend therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 16, 17, 19 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Okazawa in view of Matsuda, and Claims 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Okazawa in view of Matsuda and Moffatt. As Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 25 depend from one of independent Claims 1, 14 and 28, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, neither Matsuda nor Moffatt cure the above noted deficiencies of Okazawa.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

As Applicants have not substantively amended the claims in response to any rejection of record, should a further rejection be applied in the next Action based upon newly cited references, Applicants submit that such an action **cannot properly be considered a Final Office Action.**

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25 and 28, is patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Andrew T. Harry
Registration No. 56,959

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)